



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

V.—EARLY PARALLELISMS IN ROMAN HISTORIOGRAPHY.

Dionysius of Halicarnassus, *περὶ Θουκυδίδου* 5 and 23, gives a survey of early Greek historiography, in which he speaks of the logographers as (5) *ἓνα καὶ τὸν αὐτὸν φυλάττοντες σκοπόν, ὅσαι διεσφύζοντο παρὰ τοῖς ἐπιχωρίοις μνήμαι κατὰ ἔθνη τε καὶ κατὰ πόλεις, εἴτ' ἐν ἱεροῖς εἴτ' ἐν βεβήλοις ἀποκείμεναι γραφαί, ταύτας εἰς τὴν κοινὴν ἀπάντων γνῶσιν ἐξενεγκεῖν, οἷας παρέλαβον, μήτε προστιθέντες αὐταῖς τι μήτ' ἀφαιροῦντες* . . . *λέξιν* . . . *ἐπιτηδεύσαντες* . . . *τὴν σαφὴ καὶ κοινὴν καὶ καθαρὰν καὶ σύντομον καὶ τοῖς πράγμασι προσφυὴ καὶ μηδεμίαν σκευωρίαν ἐπιφαίνουσαν τεχνικὴν.* ὁ δ' Ἀλικαρνασσεὺς Ἡρόδοτος, he continues, . . . *τὴν τε πραγματικὴν προαίρεσιν ἐπὶ τὸ μείζον ἐξήνεγκε καὶ λαμπρότερον* . . . *καὶ τῇ λέξει προσαπέδωκε τὰς παραλειφθείσας ὑπὸ τῶν πρὸ αὐτοῦ συγγραφέων ἀρετάς.* (23) *οὗτος δὲ κατὰ τὴν ἐκλογὴν τῶν ὀνομάτων καὶ κατὰ τὴν σύνθεσιν καὶ κατὰ τὴν τῶν σχηματισμῶν ποικιλίαν, μακρῶ δὴ τινι τοὺς ἄλλους ὑπερεβάλετο.*

This passage exhibits a number of striking similarities, both in matter and phraseology, to the conversation ascribed by Cicero, *De Oratore* II 51-54, to Antonius and Catulus: “Age vero,” inquit Antonius, ‘qualis oratoris et quanti hominis in dicendo putas esse historiam scribere?’ ‘Si ut Graeci scripserunt, summi,’ inquit Catulus; ‘si ut nostri, nihil opus est oratore; satis est non esse mendacem.’ ‘Atqui, ne nostros contemnas,’ inquit Antonius, ‘Graeci quoque ipsi sic initio scriptitarunt ut noster Cato, ut Pictor, ut Piso. Erat enim historia nihil aliud nisi annalium confectio, cuius rei memoriaeque publicae retinendae causa ab initio rerum Romanarum usque ad P. Mucium pontificem maximum res omnes singulorum annorum mandabat litteris pontifex maximus efferebatque in album et proponebat tabulam domi, potestas ut esset populo cognoscendi: ii qui etiam nunc annales maximi nominantur. Hanc similitudinem (οἷας παρέλαβον) scribendi multi secuti sunt, qui sine ullis ornamentis (μηδεμίαν σκευωρίαν ἐπιφαίνουσαν τεχνικὴν) monumenta (μνήμαι) solum (μήτε προστιθέντες αὐταῖς τι μήτ' ἀφαιροῦντες) temporum hominum locorum gestarumque rerum reliquerunt. Itaque qualis apud Graecos Pherecydes Hellanicus Acusilas fuit aliiue permulti, talis noster Cato et Pictor

et Piso, qui neque tenent quibus rebus ornatur oratio—modo enim huc ista sunt importata—et, dum intellegatur quid dicant (σαφή), unam dicendi laudem putant esse brevitatem (σύντομον). Paulum se erexit (ἐπὶ τὸ μείζον ἐξήνεγκε) et addidit (προσαπέδωκε) maiorem historiae sonum vocis vir optimus Crassi familiaris Antipater. Ceteri non exornatores rerum sed tantummodo narratores fuerunt.' 'Est,' inquit Catulus, 'ut dicis. Sed iste ipse Caelius neque distinxit historiam varietate¹ colorum (κατὰ τὴν τῶν σχηματισμῶν ποικιλίαν) neque verborum collocatione (κατὰ τὴν ἐκλογὴν τῶν ὀνομάτων) et tractu orationis (κατὰ τὴν σύνθεσιν) leni et aequabili perpolivit illud opus, sed ut homo neque doctus neque maxime aptus ad dicendum, sicut potuit dolavit; vicit tamen, ut dicis, superiores (τοὺς ἄλλους ὑπερεβάλετο).'"

In the above conversation, Cicero seems partly to accept, partly to criticise a comparison of the earliest Latin historians to the Greek logographers, and of Caelius Antipater, the first Roman *exornator rerum*, to Herodotus, *qui princeps genus hoc ornavit* (De Or. II 55). Antonius is appropriately made an apologist for the Roman side, while Catulus denies that Caelius has paralleled the achievements of Herodotus in the two divisions of λέξις and the use of imagery (περὶ Θουκ. 22).

The resemblances in phraseology indicate that the original of the sketch in Dionysius was used as a model by some Roman literary critic prior to the time of composition of the De Oratore. It seems altogether likely that the body of criticism extant in Cicero's time, which made Ennius a Homer, Afranius a Menander, and Plautus an Epicharmus, and manufactured an analogue for the old Attic comedy, also carried parallelism with Greek literature into the field of historical composition. Cicero, admitting the undeveloped state of Roman historiography, protests against the exaggerated rank which had been given to Caelius. The Latin authority used by Cicero may also have contained a characterization of Greek historians, which was a model for the estimate of them given by Antonius directly following the passage quoted above.

Cicero has, in De Legibus I 5-7, a personal motive for disparaging the Roman historians, for his plan, which Atticus here urges him to fulfil, is to write himself a history which shall be

¹ If the grouping of these passages from Dionysius and Cicero be right, it affords evidence for the correctness of Jacobs' emendation of *colorum* (54) in place of the MS reading *locorum*.

worthy of comparison with the productions of the Greeks. In surveying the field of historical composition, he again uses the two-fold classification employed in the *De Oratore*, making Atticus, in language which recalls the earlier criticism, say of Caelius, who begins the new epoch: "Antipater paulo inflavit vehementius habuitque vires agrestis ille quidem atque horridas, sine nitore ac palaestra, sed tamen admonere reliquos potuit ut adcuratius scriberent." The predecessors of Caelius are grouped as *exiles scriptores*, while Sisenna¹ is recognized as the best Roman historian up to that time, and compared to Clitarchus, which was perhaps another current literary parallelism.

In the *Brutus*, 63 and 66, Cicero makes use of a comparison, for which the Atticists² of his time seem to be responsible, of Cato to Lysias, Philistus, and Thucydides. Later in the work (293, 294), this estimate is criticised and corrected by Atticus, who calls it an example of Socratic irony. It seems probable that Cicero is here dealing with another current literary parallelism, which he criticises through a person of the dialogue, as in the *De Oratore* and *De Legibus*.

Cicero, in his own opinion and in that of his friends, was the man to write an appropriate history of Rome. This judgment is stated by Nepos³ in *libro de historicis Latinis*, fr. 7: "Non ignorare debes unum hoc genus Latinarum litterarum adhuc non modo non respondere Graeciae, sed omnino rude atque incohatum morte Ciceronis relictum. ille enim fuit unus qui potuerit et etiam debuerit historiam digna voce pronuntiare, quippe qui oratoriam eloquentiam rudem a maioribus acceptam perpoliverit, philosophiam ante eum incomptam Latinam sua conformavit oratione. ex quo dubito interitu eius utrum res publica an historia magis doleat."

From the preceding discussion, the conclusion seems to follow that there existed in Cicero's time a body of early literary criticism which in historiography compared Roman writers to individual Greek writers—Caelius to Herodotus and the predecessors of Caelius to the Greek logographers, Cato to Thucydides, and Sisenna to Clitarchus. This would give the Romans representatives in the three departments of σύνθεσις—ἀνσθηρά, ἀνθηρά, and

¹ Cf. *Brutus*, 228.

² Norden, *Antike Kunstprosa* I 258-259.

³ Cf. Atticus in *De Legibus* I 5-7.

κοινῇ. The early critics seem to have considered Latin literature in all its branches as developed and complete. Cicero and his friends, while admitting that in historiography these comparisons are to some extent justifiable, criticise and limit them, and call attention to the rudimentary condition of Roman literature in this department.

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO.

JOHN D. WOLCOTT.